

## **REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has stated that claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims and specification are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Both the claims and specification use terminology that is inconsistent with standard English usage of common words and thus make a true understanding of the invention impossible.

Responsive to this, the claims and specification has been carefully amended to conform with current U.S. practice. In addition, figures 1, 3, 5-7 and 11 have been further amended. The amended figures are attached.

After the amendment to the claim and remark, the anticipation

rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests a timely examination.

Respectfully submitted,

✓  
→ By: CHEN JIN Fu  
JIN FU CHEN (CHEN is family name)

Dated: 18 December 2003

P.O. BOX 2103,  
Taichung, Taiwan,  
Republic of China